



Corres. and Mail
BOX AF

AF/2194
ZMM
MAIL STOP AF
RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
EXAMINING GROUP 2100

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: C.P. Morrison et al.

Attorney Docket No.: MSFT125568

Application No.: 10/043,364

Art Unit: 2194 / Confirmation No: 7247

Filed: January 9, 2002

Examiner: V.H. Nguyen

Title: METHODS AND SYSTEMS FOR MANAGING AN APPLICATION'S
RELATIONSHIP TO ITS RUN-TIME ENVIRONMENT

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL

Seattle, Washington 98101

March 30, 2006

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

Applicants respectfully request that the above-identified application be re-examined.

The final Office Action mailed on December 30, 2005 ("Office Action"), finally rejected Claims 1-34. Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 11, 14-16, 18-28, and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being fully anticipated by the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 6,698,012 B1, issued to Kossatchev et al. ("Kossatchev").

Claims 2, 4, 9, 12, 13, 17, 29, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of the teachings of Kossatchev taken in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 6,754,850 B2, issued to Grey et al. ("Grey").

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his time during an Examiner interview, conducted by telephone, on February 21, 2006, at 1:00 p.m. During the interview, the Examiner mentioned the rejection of Claims 1-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicants' attorney noted that the Office Action did not include rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and, hence, the applicants considered this ground of rejection withdrawn as a result of the argument presented in response to the first Office Action. Applicants' attorney suggested that if the Examiner still

LAW OFFICES OF
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS^{PLLC}
1420 Fifth Avenue
Suite 2800
Seattle, Washington 98101
206.682.8100